

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 17, 2009
TITLE: 232 East Olin Avenue – Street Graphics Size Variance from a Provision of UDD No. 1 for “Coliseum Bar and Banquet.” 14 th Ald. Dist. (14267)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 17, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, Todd Barnett, Dawn Weber, Jay Ferm and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 17, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a ground size variance from the provision located at 232 East Olin Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jeff Solner. Prior to the presentation staff provided an overview on the prior consideration of the ground sign variance for this project, noting issues with its original consideration at the meeting of April 22, 2009, where a height variance was granted by the Commission which was accompanied by the lack of specification on a necessary size variance also required with the sign. Further consideration at the meeting of June 3, 2009 was referred in order for the applicant to provide for additional information on the site context for the proposed ground sign, including landscaping as well as additional information as to visibility issues from adjacent rights-of-way, and details on existing signage already established for the project. Solner then provided a presentation on the request size variance to allow for a 60 square foot ground sign, 20-feet in excess of the 40 square feet allowed under the provisions for Urban Design District No. 1. Solner elaborated on communication difficulties regarding regulations with other members of City staff, and the need to provide for approval of the sign based on his misunderstanding on a preliminary approval by other City staff. Following his presentation the Commission noted that approving the sign may set a precedent with a mistake not bound by regulations. It was further noted that issues with the existing sign’s non-conformity with prior approvals combined with the current sign as proposed was problematic and that the signage as proposed still presented issues with visibility, not resolved with making it bigger. Further discussion noted favorable consideration based on miscommunications with staff on the preliminary approval of the sign, as well as its favorable consideration based on address of the standards contained in Section 33.24(8)(c)4.a.viii.A., Madison General Ordinances, which states the following:

“An exception from the size limitation is necessary for a sign located on the site of an establishment to be identifiable and legible for the nearest roadway at prevailing speeds...”

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Weber, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-3) with Wagner, Weber, Woods, Barnett and Slayton voting in favor, and Rummel, Smith and Ferm voting no. The motion required at a change of occupancy or if

the sign is removed or replaced it is required to comply with the standards of Urban Design District No. 1. The motion cited the sign's consistency with the provisions of Section 33.24(a)(c)4.a.viii.A., Madison General Ordinances.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 2, 2, 3 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 232 East Olin Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2

General Comments:

- Applicant with 20 years experience failed to follow City process and erected a sign without permit that also fails to serve its purpose, to be a visible marker for the business as it remains hidden by landscaping. By approving this proposal, the UDC sends the signal that poor design and skirting the rules is OK.
- Sign is illegal – how did this happen? Don't do this again!